

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-7, 11, 14-15, 23-29, and 32-37 will remain pending in this application. Claims 8-10 and 16-22 were previously cancelled. Claims 12-13 and 30-31 are cancelled in this paper. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by the present amendment. In particular, Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter added to claims 1, 11, 23, 29, and 34 is supported in the Specification at least at paragraphs [0099] (“At 330, the device 310 declares a set of media functionality it possesses via the mechanism of the invention”), [0100] (“the media center UI is presented to the remote device with the appropriate functionality enabled”), [0105]-[0112], and Table I (disclosing several exemplary media functions that are supported by different types of devices).

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 23, 24, 28, and 34-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0109718 (“Mansour et al.”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,078,961 (“Mourad et al.”). Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 14, 15, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Mansour et al. in view of Mourad et al., and further in view of “Remote Desktop Protocol (RDP) Features and Performance” (Microsoft white paper from June 2000, hereinafter “RDP White Paper”). Claims 5 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Mansour et al. in view of Mourad et al., and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0075301 (“Basso et al.”). Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Mansour et al. in view of Mourad et al. and RDP White Paper, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,970,920 (“Poirier et al.”). Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Mansour et al. in view of RDP White Paper. Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Mansour et al. in view of RDP White Paper and further in view of Poirier et al.

Interview Summary

Applicants' representative, Mr. Eiferman, and Examiner David Lazaro participated in a telephonic interview on February 13, 2008 to discuss the amendments herein. Examiner Lazaro agreed to reevaluate the pending rejections in light of the amendments and arguments contained herein.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 23, 24, 28, and 34-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Mansour et al. in view of Mourad et al. With respect to claim 1, the rejection is understood to be based on the premise that Mansour et al. teaches all of the features of claim 1, except that the tailored user interface is received via a user interface channel and the media component is received via a media channel. Mourad et al. is cited as teaching that a separate channel can be used for transferring media data while other data uses another channel, such that the media channel provides a path for media that requires high amounts of bandwidth.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Among other limitations, claim 1 has been amended to recite the steps of:

“automatically transmitting at least one media capabilities token based upon a set of media functions supported by the remote device to the host device” and

“in response to said transmitting, receiving at the remote device a custom remote media experience user interface tailored to the remote device via a user interface channel, the remote media experience user interface enabling only the media functions supported by the remote device.”

Accordingly, claim 1 clearly states that the media capabilities token is based on media functions supported by the remote device, and that the remote media experience user interface enables only the media functions supported by the remote device. By contrast, while paragraphs [0097]-[0112] of Mansour et al. disclose the obtaining of “device capabilities” such as “display screen dimensions,” “form area dimensions,” “desired or default font,” “list of available native icons,” *etc.*, these “device capabilities” do not amount to the “media functions supported by the remote device” recited in claim 1. Further, Mourad et al. does not appear to be concerned with declarations of device capabilities at all.

For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Mansour et al. and Mourad et al. fail to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1, whether considered individually or in combination. In particular, Mansour et al. and Mourad et al. fail to disclose at least the limitations “automatically transmitting at least one media capabilities token based upon a set of media functions supported by the remote device to the host device” and “in response to said transmitting, receiving at the remote device a custom remote media experience user interface tailored to the remote device via a user interface channel, the remote media experience user interface enabling only the media functions supported by the remote device.”

Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Mansour et al. in view of Mourad et al. Claims 2, 6, and 7 depend from claim 1 and are also patentable over Mansour et al. in view of Mourad et al. at least by reason of this dependency. Claim 23 recites similar limitations as claim 1, and the above remarks regarding claim 1 apply equally to claim 23. Accordingly, claim 23 is also patentable over Mansour et al. in view of Mourad et al. Claims 24 and 28 depend from claim 23 and are also patentable over Mansour et al. in view of Mourad et al. at least by reason of this dependency.

Claim 34 has been amended to recite, among others, the limitations “a remote device connected to said host device, wherein said remote device declares to said host device a set of media functions supported by the remote device” and “a user interface channel through which said host device transmits a user interface to said remote device tailored to the media capabilities of said remote device, the user interface enabling only the media functions supported by the remote device.” As discussed above in connection with claim 1, Mansour et al. and Mourad et al. fail to teach a remote device that declares to the host device a set of media functions supported by the remote device and also fail to teach the transmission of a user interface that enables only the media functions supported by the remote device. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Mansour et al. and Mourad et al. fail to disclose all of the limitations of claim 34, whether considered individually or in combination, and that claim 34 is patentable over Mansour et al. in view of Mourad et al. Claims 35-37 depend from claim 34 and are also patentable over Mansour et al. in view of Mourad et al. at least by reason of this dependency.

Claims 3, 4, 11, 12, 14, 15, 25, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Mansour et al. in view of Mourad et al., and further in view

of RDP White Paper. The rejection is understood to be based on the premise that RDP White Paper teaches the various limitations added by these dependent claims. Applicant does not understand RDP White Paper as being alleged to teach the limitations of the independent claims. Claim 12 has been cancelled.

Claim 11 has been amended to recite, among others, the limitations

“monitoring the virtual channel for the remote device to establish a connection until a timeout period expires;”

“upon the remote device connecting via the virtual channel, receiving from the remote device at least one media capabilities token based upon a set of media functions supported by the remote device;”

“transmitting a custom media experience user interface to the remote device via a user interface channel based upon said at least one media capabilities token, the custom media experience user interface enabling only the media functions supported by the remote device;”
and

“if no valid media capability token is received from the remote device within the timeout period, assuming a generic set of media functions supported by the remote device and transmitting a media experience user interface to the remote device via the user interface channel, the media experience user interface enabling the generic set of media functions.”

As discussed above in connection with claim 1, Mansour et al. and Mourad et al. fail to teach receiving from the remote device at least one media capabilities token based on a set of media functions supported by the remote device and also fail to teach transmitting a custom media experience user interface that enables only the media functions supported by the remote device. RDP White Paper is not understood as being alleged to supply these teachings. Accordingly, claim 11 is patentable over Mansour et al. in view of Mourad et al. and further in view of RDP White Paper. While Poirier et al. has not been cited in connection with claim 11, Applicant believes it is appropriate to point out that, while Poirier et al. is alleged to teach monitoring a virtual channel until a timeout period completes, Applicant does not understand Poirier et al. as being alleged to teach the other limitations of claim 11, particularly those set forth in these Remarks.

With respect to the remaining claims, it will be appreciated that claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1, claims 14 and 15 depend from claim 11, and claims 25-26 depend from claim

23. Because the rejection of these claims directly or indirectly involves the Examiner's application of Mansour et al. to the independent claims from which these claims depend, Applicant also respectfully traverses the rejection for the reasons set forth above in connection with the independent claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 4, 11, 14, 15, 25, and 26 are patentable over Mansour et al. in view of Mourad et al. and further in view of RDP White Paper.

Claims 5 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Mansour et al. in view of Mourad et al., and further in view of Basso et al. The rejection is understood to be based on the premise that Basso et al. teaches that media capabilities can be expressed in string format. Applicant does not understand Basso et al. as being alleged to teach the limitations of the independent claims. It will be appreciated that claims 5 and 27 depend from claims 1 and 23, respectively. Because the rejection of claims 5 and 27 involves the Examiner's application of Mansour et al. to the independent claims from which claims 5 and 27 depend, Applicant also respectfully traverses the rejection for the reasons set forth above in connection with the independent claims. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 5 and 27 are patentable over Mansour et al. in view of Mourad et al. and further in view of Basso et al.

Claim 13 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Mansour et al. in view of Mourad et al. and RDP White Paper and further in view of Poirier et al. Claim 13 has been cancelled and its limitations incorporated into claim 11.

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Mansour et al. in view of RDP White Paper. Claim 29 recites similar limitations to claim 11, and the above remarks regarding claim 11 apply equally to claim 29. Accordingly, claim 29 is also patentable over Mansour et al. in view of RDP White Paper. Applicant further submits that claim 29 would also be patentable over a hypothetical combination of Mansour et al., RDP White Paper, and Poirier et al. for the reasons set forth above in connection with claim 11.

Claim 31 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Mansour et al. in view of RDP White Paper and further in view of Poirier et al. Claim 31 has been cancelled and its limitations incorporated into claim 29.

DOCKET NO.: 306494.01 / MSFT-2773
Application No.: 10/674,706
Office Action Dated: November 27, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

Based at least on the above remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the currently pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record and requests reconsideration and removal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

DOCKET NO.: 306494.01 / MSFT-2773
Application No.: 10/674,706
Office Action Dated: November 27, 2007

**PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116**

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: March 27, 2008

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman

Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439